F
466
.S844

MISSOURI'S CENTENNIAL

BY

WALTER B. STEVENS

Class F466

Book .S844

PRESENTED BY

MISSOURI'S CENTENNIAL

BY

WALTER B. STEVENS

Compliments of

WALTER B. STEVENS

PUBLISHED BY
THE STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF MISSOURI
COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
1917

F466
.S844

MISSOURI'S CENTENNIAL.

BY

WALTER B. STEVENS.*

Other States have birthdays, Missouri has birth years. In other commonwealths the centennial of statehood means a celebration of local concern. Missouri approaches the observance of a centennial period of nation-wide interest. One hundred years ago there was before the American people no issue greater, more serious than "the Missouri question."

The action of President White and his associates of the State Historical Society in calling together this Committee of One Thousand is timely. Missouri's Centennial will begin in another month. That centennial is not limited to a day, a month, or even a year. It is a period. In 1817 the movement for statehood of Missouri had its formal beginning. That year was known to its generation as "the maniacal year." In Old Franklin, St. Charles, Herculaneum, Ste. Genevieve, Cape Girardeau, St. Louis and all of the other centers fast growing in population, men were signing petitions praying the Congress of the United States that Missouri Territory "may be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States." They were not crazy.

*(An address delivered before the Missouri Centennial Committee of One Thousand, at Kansas City, November 24, 1916.)

The statehood movement gave no reason for the designation of 1817 as "the maniacal year." There were many other events of an exciting character. To settle personal differences Missourians made several visits to Bloody Island that year. Benton fought his two duels with Lucas. The territorial legislature granted three charters for lotteries,—one for an academy at Potosi, one for a fire engine at St. Louis, and one for a masonic hall. The first steamboat arrived at St. Louis and Missourians paid a dollar apiece to step on board and look around. So many availed themselves of this privilege that the captain admitted them in relays to avert capsizing. The bank of Missouri was started and paper money, redeemable at a distant point, was issued. But what set Missouri wildest was the immigration. The Rev. Dr. John Mason Peck arrived and wrote this of what he saw:

"The 'new comers,' like a mountain torrent, poured into the country faster than it was possible to provide corn for breadstuff. Some families came in the spring of 1815. But in the winter, spring, summer and autumn of 1816, they came like an avalanche. It seemed as though Kentucky and Tennessee were breaking up and moving to the 'Far West.' Caravan after caravan passed over the prairies of Illinois, crossing the 'great river' at St. Louis, all bound to the Boone's Lick. The stream of immigration had not lessened in 1817. Many families came from Virginia, the Carolinas and Georgia, and not a few from the Middle States, while a sprinkling found their way to the extreme West from Yankeedom and Yorkdom. Following in the wake of this exodus to the middle section of Missouri was a terrific excitement about land."

It was high time, in 1817, for Missourians to ask statehood. Across the river, Illinois, with less population than Missouri, was signing petitions for admission. Seven States had been added to the original Thirteen. Missouri was growing faster than any of them. Moreover Missouri had a claim to statehood based on international treaty. When France ceded to the United States the great territory west

of the Mississippi, it was stipulated that the inhabitants, "shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States and admitted, as soon as possible, according to the principles of the federal constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States." That agreement between France and the United States had been in effect fourteen years when Missourians moved in the matter of statehood.

The Missouri petitions were presented to Congress on the 8th of January, 1818. The date was fitting. It was the anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans fought by Andrew Jackson with Missouri lead. That same month the petitions for Illinois were presented. Before the end of the year, Congress had enacted the necessary legislation for Illinois, and the convention had met at Kaskaskia to frame a constitution. Thus Illinois, in December, 1818, was made a State. Missouri waited—waited from January 8, 1818, to March 6, 1820, for the enabling act. Meantime a great and dangerous game in national politics went on. The Senate, by a majority vote, was ready to admit Missouri. The House of Representatives insisted that Missouri must abolish slavery gradually and must put into the constitution a promise to that effect, as a condition of admission to the Union.

Week after week the one-horse mail brought to Missouri the aggravating news. Congress adjourned in March, 1819, the Senate and the House in deadlock on the bill. Then the storm of resentment in Missouri broke.

One grand jury after another delivered its pronouncement. The grand jury at St. Louis declared that the course of Congress was "an unconstitutional and an unwarrantable usurpation over our inalienable rights and privileges as a free people."

The grand jury of Jefferson county, while declaring that "slavery is an evil we do not pretend to deny," argued that the Constitution of the United States did not empower Congress "by express grant or necessary implication to make the whole or any part of the constitution" of a State.

One hundred years ago Missouri Territory was divided into seven counties. The grand jury of every county went on record in most formal protest against the attitude of Congress towards Missouri Territory.

From April, 1819, to December, 1819, wherever Missourians assembled, resolutions were adopted or toasts were drank in defiance of the dictation by Congress as to what should be put in the constitution on the subject of slavery. And these sentiments were indorsed with prolonged cheers. In these modern days, people applaud by the watch. The minutes are timed. Newspapers and partisans measure popular sentiment by the duration of the applause. A hundred years ago the successive cheers were counted. After drinking fervently to a sentiment the people "hip hip hurrahed." Their enthusiasm was measured by the number of these cheers. There was no fictitious swelling of sound by blowing of horns, by the ringing of cowbells, by the stamping of feet. It was all vociferous. And when the tumult and the shouting died, everybody knew that the sentiment or the candidate had been indorsed by one or ten or twenty cheers. Thus at a St. Louis meeting, over which Auguste Chouteau presided, the Missouri Gazette reported that these two toasts "received the largest number of cheers."

"The next Congress—A sacred regard for the Constitution, in preference to measures of supposed expediency, will insure to them the confidence of the American people." "Nineteen cheers. Yankee Doodle (music)."

"The Territory of Missouri—With a population of near 100,000, demands her right to be admitted into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States." "Nineteen cheers—'Scott's o'er the Border.' "

Within the present year there has appeared a book with the title "Missouri's Struggle for Statehood," by Floyd C. Shoemaker, the secretary of the State Historical Society. Mr. Shoemaker has devoted the spare hours of five years to the assembling of information about the "Struggle." He has gone to original sources for the graphic details of Missouri's protest.

Even the ministers of the Gospel were not silent. The Baptist Association, assembled "at Pleasant Green Meeting House" in Howard county, resolved that we "believe the question of slavery is one that belongs exclusively to the people to decide on."

That was mild and dignified, however, as compared with the other sentiments thundered from the Mississippi and Missouri river settlements.

At Franklin, when the whole Boone's Lick country was celebrating the arrival of the first steamboat, Stephen Rector, of the truculent and fighting tribe of Rectors, aroused the banqueters with,—

"May the Missourians defend their rights, if necessary, even at the expense of blood, against the unprecedented restriction which was attempted to be imposed upon them by the Congress of the United States."

Tallmadge and Taylor were two northern Representatives in Congress who led the fight to make Missouri come in as a free State. At the Fourth of July celebration in St. Louis that year, the Missourians paid their respects to these two statesmen in this toast:

"Messrs. Tallmadge and Taylor—Politically insane,—May the next Congress appoint them a dark room, a straight waistcoat and a thin water gruel diet."

The toast was drunk, and the newspaper report says it was followed by nineteen cheers, and the band played Yankee Doodle.

Probably the most significant and effective of these protesting meetings was one at which Thomas H. Benton presented the resolutions. These resolutions were in the form of an ultimatum to Congress. They were passed upon by William C. Carr, Henry S. Geyer, Edward Bates, Joshua Barton before being adopted unanimously. Alexander McNair presided at the meeting. David Barton was secretary. This, then, was the action of the men who were to be the first Governor and the first two Senators and the acknowledged leaders in the new State. The resolutions declared "that the Congress of the United States have no right to control the

provisions of a state constitution, except to preserve its republican character." They denounced the action of the House of Representatives as "an outrage on the principles of the American constitution." But the concluding resolution presented to Congress and the rest of the country a startling situation:

"That the people of this territory have a right to meet in convention by their own authority, and to form a constitution and state government, whenever they shall deem it expedient to do so, and that a second determination on the part of Congress to refuse them admission, upon an equal footing with the original States, will make it expedient to exercise that right."

There might be Missouri compromises in Congress. There was to be no Missouri compromise in Missouri.

The threats were not few that if Congress persisted in tying strings to Missouri's admission, the people of the territory might reject the terms and set up independent government for themselves.

A meeting at St. Ferdinand, where according to tradition was the earliest settlement of Americans in Missouri, by two or three families from North Carolina, this sentiment was proposed:

"The Territory of Missouri—May she be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, or not received in any other way."

This toast, the reporter of 1819 tells was "drank standing up.—Twenty-two cheers."

Is it any wonder that Thomas Jefferson, growing old and perhaps a little querulous, viewed the deadlock in Congress and the defiance of the territory with dismal forbodings? He wrote to John Adams: "The Missouri question is a breaker on which we lose the Missouri country by revolt and what more God only knows." Two months later when Congress, in spite of Henry Clay's appeals, seemed as far as ever from the solution, Mr. Jefferson wrote to Hugh Nelson: "The Missouri question is the most portentous which ever threatened our Union. In the gloomiest days of the Revolutionary war

I never had any apprehensions equal to what I feel from this source."

There were anti-slavery men in Missouri. Emancipationists they called themselves, but more frequently restrictionists. But with scarcely an exception they were for the settlement of the question by the new State. The Missouri Gazette inclined toward the anti-slavery side but the editor, Joseph Charless, denounced the proposed restriction by Congress as "the most gross and barefaced usurpation that has yet been committed."

"Bear in mind, fellow citizens," he wrote, "that the question now before you is not whether slavery shall be permitted or prohibited in the future State of Missouri, but whether we shall meanly abandon our rights and suffer any earthly power to dictate the terms of our constitution."

Scattered in the Missouri settlements were men, not many in number, who were not willing to trust the people to make their own constitution. They were against statehood unless it came with a constitution which would, in time, abolish slavery. They did not hold meetings. They did not propose toasts. They wrote confidential letters to northern Congressmen urging them to keep up the fight against admission. The effect was to encourage the deadlock, to embitter popular sentiment in the territory and to insure the election of delegates, when the time came to choose them, who were strongly committed to slavery in Missouri.

While they wrangled over Missouri, the Senate and House admitted Alabama. When Congress met in December, 1819, the people of Maine were there for admission. Again the Missouri question loomed. The conflict went on until March when the bill passed permitting Missouri to frame a constitution without restriction, but providing that slavery should be excluded from the rest of the Louisiana Purchase territory west and north of Missouri. And that exclusion was the Missouri compromise which vexed American politics for thirty-seven years, only to be declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court in March, 1857.

The compromise measure was put through by parliamentary legerdemain on the part of Speaker Henry Clay. When the House met in the morning, Mr. Randolph moved reconsideration of the vote by which the bill had passed the day previous. He thought he had votes enough to block the compromise of "the doughfaces" as he called them. Speaker Clay ruled that Mr. Randolph's motion was out of order until the regular morning business was disposed of. But, while the morning business was before the House, Mr. Clay signed the bill and rushed it by the clerk to the Senate. At the close of the morning hour, Mr. Randolph again rose and moved the reconsideration. Speaker Clay told him he was too late; that the bill was no longer in the possession of the House. Mr. Randolph added this to other grievances he held against Mr. Clay. The enmity grew until it had its climax in the usual form of those days,—a duel. One of the finest specimens of news reporting was the account of that bloodless meeting written by Thomas H. Benton, as an eye witness. Concluding his report, Mr. Benton commented:

"It was about the last high-toned duel that I have witnessed, and among the highest-toned that I have ever witnessed, and so happily conducted to a fortunate result —a result due to the noble character of the seconds as well as to the generous and heroic spirit of the principals."

When the news of the passage of the Missouri Compromise bill was received at St. Louis and other centers of population, about the end of March, 1820, Missourians celebrated what they firmly believed was the birth of statehood. A candle burned in every window on the night chosen for formal ratification. The cartoonist of one hundred years ago arose to the occasion. He executed a transparency showing a negro slave dancing in great glee because "Congress had voted to permit the slaves to come to live in such a fine country as Missouri." The deadlock in Congress had been, in large part, the determination of the House of Representatives to insist on a constitution which would prohibit the bringing of any more slaves into Missouri. As the news

traveled slowly up the rivers, bonfires burned on the hilltops at night and jollifications were held in the day time. Charles J. Cabell told an old settlers' reunion at Keytesville in 1877 that he could not remember another day like that in his long Missouri lifetime.

One note of comment showed how determined were the Missourians that Congress should not continue to trifle with their statehood rights. In the Enquirer, the St. Louis paper for which Benton wrote, there appeared a paragraph on the 31st of March, 1820, recalling the action of the year before and telling what would have been done by the Missourians if the passage of the compromise bill had been delayed longer:

"The people of the United States would have witnessed a specimen of Missouri feeling in the indignant contempt with which they would have trampled the odious restriction under their feet and proceeded to the formation of a Republican constitution in the fulness of the people's power."

If Benton gauged the strength and extent of the Missouri sentiment at that time, Missouri may have been nearer the formation of an independent republic, to come into the Union later, as Texas did, than the historians have told. Perhaps Jefferson was correct in his judgment that the course of Congress threatened the loss of "the Missouri country and what more God only knows."

But with the passage of the compromise act, Missourians proceeded without delay to their part under the enabling provisions. They elected delegates, held the convention and drafted a constitution. It was all done before the middle of June, that year, 1820. There was, however, a rather significant utterance in the declaration of purpose:

"We the people of Missouri, inhabiting the limits hereinafter designated, by our representatives in convention assembled at St. Louis, on Monday, the 12th day of June, 1820, do mutually agree to form and establish a free and independent republic by the name of 'the State of Missouri.' "

In his valuable book, the textbook of our centennial of statehood, Mr. Shoemaker says "Missouri became a State

on Wednesday, July 19, 1820." On that day the constitution went into effect. It was accepted without question by the entire population. The regular territorial election, if Missouri had not been a State, would have been held under the former law, on the first Monday of August. It was not held. But on the fourth Monday in August, 1820, the State of Missouri elected a full complement of state officers,—executive, legislative and judicial. And Missouri went on doing business as a State from that time forward. When, a year later, on the 10th day of August, 1821, President Monroe issued the belated proclamation that Missouri was a State in the Union, it did not cause a ripple of excitement in Missouri. The two Senators and the Representative in Congress from Missouri had been drawing pay from the United States Treasury for nearly a year, although technically the act of statehood had not been consummated. Sturdy old John Scott, the Representative, the most fluently profane man in Missouri, would not permit himself to be recognized in Washington as a territorial delegate. He demanded the title and the personal consideration of a Member of Congress. Governor McNair thought the incident of President Monroe's proclamation should be followed by a special session of the legislature and issued the call. There was considerable opposition to the governor's action because, as people argued, Missouri had been a State more than a year and a session of the legislature would be a useless expense. The governor had his way and wore his beaver hat, the only one seen on that occasion. In his message to the legislature, the governor said:

"Since the organization of this government we have exhibited to the American people a spectacle novel and peculiar—an American republic on the confines of the federal Union, exercising all the powers of sovereign government, with no actual political connection with the United States, and nothing to bind us to them but a reverence for the same principles and an habitual attachment to them and to their government."

Who were the fathers of the State?

Here again Mr. Shoemaker has laid Missourians under obligations for the very interesting personal data he has assembled with exhaustive research. The members of the constitutional convention were forty-one in number. Most of them were of English descent, but two were Welsh; two were Scotch; four were Irish; four were Scotch-Irish; two were French; one was German.

As regarded nativity, these Founders of Missouri were better distributed in respect to the rest of the United States than is generally understood. Mr. Shoemaker has learned that there were in the convention native sons of Virginia, Kentucky, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, North Carolina, Upper Louisiana under Spanish Dominion, Indiana, New York, Vermont, South Carolina, Wales and Ireland. While Virginia led in the number, only three of the delegates had come directly from that State to settle in Missouri. The important and impressive fact is that these forty-one fathers of the State represented all sections of the United States, as the nation then existed, together with the principal countries of Europe.

That first constitution of Missouri was not submitted to popular vote. It went into effect at once. There was nothing in the enabling act that required submission. The convention made no provision to have the constitution passed upon by vote. The people had named their best men to do the work and were satisfied, so well satisfied indeed that the organic act endured forty-four years.

What a history it is that Missourians will review in this first one hundred years of statehood! The first Missouri question had no sooner been dismissed from national consideration for a time with President Monroe's proclamation than other Missouri questions focused the attention of the country upon the Center State. In 1824 Missouri elected the President of the United States. John Adams had received only one-third of the popular vote. No candidate had a majority of the electors. The election passed to the

House of Representatives to decide, with one vote to be cast by each State. Missouri had only one Representative to cast her vote. Although Henry Clay, who had put through the Missouri Compromise was a candidate, hard-headed John Scott, who had the record of having challenged six men in one day to fight duels, voted Missouri for the Massachusetts man and elected him President. Scott retired to private life after that, as was to be expected, but he didn't leave Missouri. He carried an assortment of pistols and knives and died in his bed at the age of eighty, two months after Fort Sumpter was fired on. When he was near the end he drew a pistol, flourished it and said: "Show me the man that wants to destroy this great government."

If there is a subject fully as interesting as the State, in its relation to this centennial, it is the statemanship of Missourians. In every decade of the ten now nearly completed, Missourians, politically, have been of national stature and influence. The present generation is no exception. Missouri has not furnished a President but Missouri has grown Presidential timber and has had candidates whom the logic of political issues should have nominated. Missouri has offered a favorite son who nine times received the majority of his party in convention.

In 1903, Walter Williams asked 400 Missourians, representative of all parts of the State and of all vocations, "to name the leaders of the State's thought, the men who had done the most for Missouri, and through Missourians for the world." The living were excluded from consideration, properly. The poll showed a range through more than one hundred names of honored dead of Missouri. The majority vote established this interesting roll of fame:

Statesmen,—Thomas H. Benton, Francis P. Blair, John S. Phelps, B. Gratz Brown, Richard P. Bland, Hamilton R. Gamble, James S. Green, Edward Bates.

Father of the State University,—James S. Rollins.

Soldiers,—Sterling Price, A. W. Doniphan.

Engineer,—James B. Eads.

Preacher,—Enoch Mather Marvin.

Poet,—Eugene Field.

Artist,—George C. Bingham.

Conditions which govern the placing of effigies of great Americans in Statuary Hall, of the Capitol at Washington, limit each State to two representatives. Missouri has four places. Benton and Blair were placed there in obedience to the unanimous sentiment of Missourians. Shields, who made his home and was buried in Missouri, won his place by virtue of service as a United States Senator from three States and as a hero in two wars. The fourth Missourian in Statuary Hall is Joseph E. Kenna who, as a Missouri lad of sixteen, joined Shelby in 1861. After the war Kenna settled in West Virginia and became a United States Senator and a much loved citizen of his adopted State.

Strange to tell, Grant, Sherman, Sheridan and Schofield, who in succession received the highest rank in the United States army, saw their earliest war service in Missouri, in 1861.

A consistent crusade against the rules of the House of Representatives, which rules had for generations enabled the Speaker and a little oligarchy of "ruling elders" to maintain absolute control of legislation, made one Missourian distinguished as a national leader. And when the House passed under the control of his party this Missourian was chosen Speaker by the unanimous vote of the party caucus, an honor without precedent in the history of Congress.

In both branches of Congress, from the beginning of statehood, Missourians have stood for independent thinking on public questions. Missouri Senators and Representatives have dared to differ frequently with Presidents of their own parties. The course of Cockrell and Vest in rebuking executive efforts to influence legislation was historic, and it brought upon them the commendation rather than the condemnation of their Missouri constituents. More recently, within this decade, a Missouri Senator has found vindication for his insistence upon rigid scrutiny of administration measures. Discussing a pending bill he said: "As long as I live I do not intend to vest in a board of men the power to do some-

thing of great moment, great sweep and great gravity, when I do not entertain a clear idea as to the powers I have granted." This is no injection of politics into a discussion of Missouri's Centennial. It is simply by way of calling attention to the characteristic course of the men Missouri has been sending to Congress from the first to the closing decade of the century of statehood. "The king can do no wrong" has never had place in Missouri sentiment.

Ten years after the close of the Civil war, a Missourian began his stubborn contest in Congress for the plain people. Richard P. Bland was the great commoner of his generation. It matters not what may have been thought, pro or con, of the silver issue when it was pending. It matters not that coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one became a past issue. Bland's voice was raised in season and out of season for what he conceived to be the rights of the American masses. Free and unlimited coinage of silver was not with him the end. It was only a means to an end. In the Congress preceding the one in which began his great career, for it was great in the championship of a national issue, silver had been demonetized save as a subsidiary metal. Immediately Bland began his work, introducing in 1876 his bill for the restoration of the double standard. Thenceforward he kept the question to the front until he made it the paramount issue before the country in 1896. He talked at every session upon "the burden on the people of the West and South."

"The common people cannot come to this capitol," he said. "They are not here in your lobby. They are at home, following the plow, cultivating the soil, or working in their workshops. It is the silvern and golden slippers of the money kings, the bankers and financiers, whose step is heard in the lobbies, and these rule the finances of the country. They are the men who get access to your committees, and have ruled and controlled the legislation of the country for their own interests. If the constituents of those who are opposing this measure could look down from the galleries upon them, they would sink in their seats with shame for the course they are pursuing, because it is adverse to the interests of the people."

And when, in 1893, a Democratic President, called Congress in special session to repeal the silver purchasing act, Bland stood forth against the President of his own party in a speech which became historic as the "parting-of-the-ways."

"Speaking as a Democrat, all my life battling for what I conceived to be Democracy and what I conceived to be right, I am yet an American above Democracy. I do not intend, we do not intend, that any party shall survive, if we can help it, that will lay the confiscating hand upon Americans in the interests of England or of Europe. Now mark it. This may be strong language, but heed it. The people mean it, and, my friends of the eastern Democracy, we bid you farewell when you do this thing."

Three years later Bland led on several ballots as the candidate of the West for the Presidential nomination. He was not nominated but Missourians will always believe he was the logical candidate. Students of history will sometime trace in the career of this Missouri commoner influence of no small importance in the evolution of government for the American people. Bland, like so many Missourians who preceded and followed him in Congress, had not only courage of conviction but the mental power for leadership. Whether Missourians of today commend or condemn the judgment of these statesmen in specific acts, they all can glory in the boldness and masterfulness of the records made in national legislation.

Missouri has been the mother of States. Missouri may well call upon her children to join in the coming celebration of the centennial of statehood. The original Missouri Territory has been divided into twelve States. From the region which lay beyond the western border of the Louisiana Purchase have been created eight more States, twenty in all. In the making of these twenty States, Missourians have had no small part. Thirty years ago an omnibus enabling act brought into the Union four States at one time—North and South Dakota, Montana and Washington. The staff

correspondent of a Missouri newspaper made a trip through the about-to-be States. In every one of the four constitutional conventions, then sitting simultaneously, were former Missourians performing important functions in the drafting of the organic acts. The membership of the constitutional convention of Washington included no fewer than ten former Missourians. California was for years called a colony of Missouri. When John C. Fremont, the Pathfinder, started across the plains with the historic expedition which was followed by the addition of California to geographical union with the United States, the order sent from Washington instructed him not to take cannon. Jessie Benton Fremont, in St. Louis, withheld the stipulation about the cannon and did not allow it to reach her husband. Fremont went on, equipped for forcible conquest, if necessary, and the moral effect, supported by the presence of Missourians, determined the status of California as American territory.

"The Father of Oregon" was the title conferred upon a United States Senator from Missouri, Lewis Fields Linn. As early as 1837 Dr. Linn introduced and pushed the bill authorizing the American occupation of the Columbia river and the establishment of Oregon Territory. He became chairman of the committee put in charge of the bill and took the leadership of a five years' struggle, which ended in the success of the measure shortly after Dr. Linn's death. Benton was for war with Great Britain, if necessary, to save the great northwest to the United States when the international dispute over the boundary became irritating. He stood in the Senate for the policy that the United States should occupy and hold all of the disputed territory. He offered to take 10,000 Missourians and settle the trouble with Great Britain in sixty days.

In this wholesale winning of the West, Missourians were everywhere and foremost. They were the founders of a hundred cities beyond the borders of their own State. They were factors in the making of many States.

"The magnificent valley of the Mississippi is ours, with all its fountains, springs and floods, and woe to the statesman who shall undertake to surrender one drop of its water or one inch of its soil to any foreign power." This was Benton's defi to Great Britain in the northern boundary controversy. Between sessions of Congress, Benton, at his home in Missouri, assembled all possible information about the Northwest. He invited the fur traders, the Indian agents and the army officers to his house and made himself their friend, while he drew from them facts and impressions about the disputed territory. When he returned to Washington for successive sessions of Congress he was prepared with fresh material to discuss the boundary issue and to insist that the United States stand firmly against British aggression.

Benton was the original conservationist of the West. He wanted the government domain opened to white settlement and fought the then prevailing policy of the government under which these lands were sold to the highest bidders and passed into the hands of speculators. To Benton was due largely the change of policy by which government land passed at $1.25 an acre to actual settlers. Benton towered in the Senate thirty years, the first to serve for that length of time, mighty in debate, powerfully constructive in lawmaking for the building up of the West, a rare combination of qualities.

Atchison, several times president-pro-tem of the United States Senate, filled an hiatus when Sunday came between the expiration of one Presidential term and the beginning of another. During a visit made to his home in 1883, he was asked how he felt being President of the United States for a day. He replied: "As well as I can remember now, I went to bed and slept. The session had just closed and I had been up nights."

John S. Phelps, eleven years at the head of the Ways and Means committee of the House of Representatives, was in direct succession for the Speakership. He was sidetracked because, as they explained, the southern Congress-

men were apprehensive that the Missourian might not do just as their wing of the party desired.

John B. Clark opposed John Sherman and, almost single-handed, kept him out of the Speakership just before the war. Democratic editors followed the parliamentary battle admiringly and said, editorially, "Here is a Missourian big enough to be nominated for the Presidency."

James S. Green, by the word of James G. Blaine, was the best man on his feet in the United States Senate about 1858.

Then came the Blairs who had more influence than any other two men with Lincoln, making effective the conservative "Border States' policy" which saved this nation from disunion.

Under the earliest organization of the State, every Missourian from eighteen to forty-five was enrolled and did military service, not much of it but enough to realize the duty he owed with his citizenship. There was preparedness. And when the Mexican war came, 6,000 Missourians went to it, more than from any other State except Kentucky and Louisiana. Some of those Missourians went by river, without waiting for orders, to reinforce old "Rough and Ready" Zachary Taylor. The others marched with Doniphan in that wonderful American Anabasis. When President Lincoln saw Doniphan at the White House in 1861, he said:

"And this is Colonel Doniphan, who made the wild march against the Comanches and the Mexicans. You are the only man I ever met whose appearance came up to my expectations."

An Iowa author has chosen the exodus of the Mormons from Missouri as the subject for a book.

> "The people of Missouri,
> Like a whirlwind in its fury,
> And without a judge and jury,
> Drove the saints and spilled their blood."

So ran the version of the exodus as told by a Mormon poet. Let it be hoped that whoever writes of the Mormon war as a chapter in Missouri history will not overlook what saved the lives of Joseph Smith and the other leaders after

the surrender at Far West. As the result of a council of the principal officers of the Missouri troops, the general commanding sent this order to Doniphan:

"You will take Joseph Smith and other prisoners to the public square of Far West and shoot them at nine o'clock tomorrow morning."

To this Doniphan replied:

"It is cold blooded murder. I will not obey your order. My brigade shall march for Liberty tomorrow morning at eight o'clock; and if you execute those men I will hold you personally responsible before an earthly tribunal, so help me God!"

There was no execution. Doniphan was not court-martialed. Missouri was saved from a stain. In politics, in war and in every position of trial the courage of conviction has been characteristic of the Missourian.

After Doniphan's Expedition had added New Mexico to the United States, a Missourian, William Carr Lane, eight times mayor of St. Louis, was sent out there to be territorial governor. There was some talk that the Franklin Pierce administration might let go of part of the territory, especially the fertile Mesilla Valley which the Mexicans wanted much to retain. Lane said it should not be done and it was not done. Missourians sang:

"In sunshine and storm, in censure and praise,
Long Live Governor Lane.
He speaks what he thinks and he means what he says,
Viva Governor Lane!
No tricks, nor no bribes, nor no silly blunder
Shall steal our worthy governor's thunder,
We'll stand at his back till the day we go under,
Long live Governor Lane!"

The Mexican war was not the baptism of blood for the Missourians. Earlier than that Gentry had gone with the Missouri rangers to the Everglades of Florida at the request of President Van Buren to punish the Seminoles.

But still earlier the hearts courageous of the men who were to form the new commonwealth had been shown to the far-reaching gain of the whole United States. For reasons other than population, other than the treaty stipulation, Missouri deserved better treatment than was accorded by the United States Congress to the petitions for statehood. The War of 1812 was declared in June of that year. The same month Congress created the Territory of Missouri, giving name and government to 20,000 people and putting upon them the responsibility of defense of the long northwestern frontier. In early American history there is no better chapter on preparedness than the account those Missourians gave of themselves. Long before a gun was fired, British influence was at work among the tribes from the Great Lakes to the Missouri river. St. Louis fur traders knew it. In 1811 they sent word down the river to St. Louis "the wampum is being carried along the banks of the Missouri." The British scheme was "a universal confederacy" of the Indian nations in the northwest to overwhelm the American settlements in Missouri and Illinois as soon as the expected war came. Guns and ammunition were distributed freely to the Indians at the British posts.

Kentucky and Tennessee sent word to their Missouri kindred offering help to defend the border. Missourians replied that they could take care of themselves, and they did. Five regiments of Missourians were organized in 1812 for home defense. The next year two more regiments were formed. Indians came down from the north and were driven back. Every settlement had its fort. Men in squads went to their fields and carried their guns while they plowed. When Governor Howard suggested that these Missouri pioneers come nearer St. Louis for protection until the war was over, the messenger carried back this reply from Captain Sarshall Cooper, commanding at Boone's Lick:

"We have maid our hoams here & all we hav is here & it wud ruen us to Leave now. We be all good Americans, not a Tory or one of his Pups among us & we hav 2 hundred

Men and Boys that will Fight to the last & we hav 100 Wimen Girls that will tak there places wh. makes a good force. So we can Defend this Settlement wh. with Gods Help we will do. So if we had a fiew barls of Powder and 2 hundred Lead is all we ask."

The fighting line was pushed northward. Fifteen hundred Missouri rangers rode up the Mississippi Valley on the Missouri side, swam their horses across the river near Fort Mason and marched through Illinois, driving the Indians before them. They camped at Lake Peoria and built Fort Clark. One column went to the northwestern corner of Illinois. Another went up the Illinois river toward Lake Michigan. Defeat of the British plan to overwhelm Missouri and Illinois settlements was complete. When the war was ended, Missourians were just ready to begin. They had not only mobilized their own fighting strength but they had forty Indian chiefs with thousand of warriors to go against the British and their red allies about the Great Lakes.

These were the Missourians to whom Congress three years later denied statehood except with conditions such as had been imposed upon no other State.

After organizing the Indian hostilities all along the western and northwestern borders of the United States for the war of 1812, the British government, when peace came under the treaty of Ghent, imposed upon the United States the responsibility of restoring tranquility among the Indian nations in the West. This was accomplished by Missourians at the great council held at Portage des Sioux in 1815. The chiefs and head men came from a hundred tribes. They camped at the crossing just above the junction of the Mississippi and Missouri rivers. They listened to the orations of the Missourians, smoked the pipe of peace and paddled away to their camps hundreds of miles up the Illinois, the Mississippi, the Missouri and their tributaries.

There is nothing finer in the long and bloody history of the relations between white man and red man of America than the policy of the French habitants of Missouri toward the tribes. Auguste Chouteau, the boy who had led "the

first thirty" to the building of St. Louis, was the historic figure in the Portage des Sioux council. He voiced that policy which had secured for St. Louis fifty years of harmony with the Indians, broken only once when British agents planned and inspired an attack in 1780.

"Put in your minds," said Auguste Chouteau, at the Portage des Sioux council, using the figurative speech so attractive to the Indian mind, "that as soon as the British made peace with us, they left you in the middle of the prairie without a shade or cover against the sun and rain. The British left you positively in the middle of the prairie, worthy of pity. But we Americans have a large umbrella which covers us against the sun and rain and we offer you, as friends, a share of it."

From the cliff of Herculaneum, below St. Louis was dropped Missouri lead which made buckshot and ball for the War of 1812. The maker was a Frenchman who had been imprisoned in the Bastile for his republican sentiments and who had come to Missouri to live. He went to New Orleans with his ammunition for Andrew Jackson's army. He was there when the battle was fought, with disaster to Packenham. He sent the news, by slow mail of course, to St. Louis. The letter was made public as soon as received. That night the liberty loving French Missourians and the patriotic American Missourians burned candles in all of the windows of the town, "in honor of the brilliant success of the American arms at New Orleans," as the Gazette, the only newspaper printed west of the Mississippi, said.

Even earlier than the War of 1812 and the transfer of sovereignty of the Louisiana Province to the United States there was sympathy of the most practical kind with the patriots of the Atlantic seaboard in the war for independence. An Episcopal bishop of Missouri,—Robertson,—delving in colonial history, found one of the most interesting chapters for the history of that period in the material support which the French settlers of St. Louis and Ste. Genevieve extended to George Rogers Clark and the Virginians in the conquest

of the Northwest Territory. Missouri lead was carried, surreptitiously but none the less effectively, to Washington's army. The French lead miners and traders shipped the lead in pirogues down the Mississippi to be delivered, ostensibly in New Orleans. But below the mouth of the Ohio the pirogues were found floating keel upward, as the tradition goes. It was given out that river pirates had captured the cargoes. Long afterward tradition told that the Missouri lead was transhipped at the mouth of the Ohio and paddled up that stream to headwaters for transport across the mountains to the American army.

Bishop Robertson told the story of Francis Vigo. Here was a Missouri patriot who so served the American cause at the time of the Revolution, that Robertson said of him:

"It was only by such aid that Colonel Clark (George Rogers) was enabled to maintain the posts which he had conquered on the Wabash and the Mississippi until the close of the war (Revolutionary), by which he saved to the nation the vast territory lying between the Ohio and the Lakes. Few others have done more to shape the fortunes of the West."

Vigo was an Italian by birth, Spanish by allegiance. He lived in St. Louis and traded with the Indians along the Missouri, amassing considerable means. He risked his life to carry to George Rogers Clark information of conditions at Vincennes which enabled Clark to capture that post vital to British control of what is now Indiana. He gave of his means to furnish Clark with supplies for that memorable expedition from Kaskaskia, so graphically described by a Missourian, Churchill. The end of the Revolutionary war found Vigo well nigh impoverished, with $20,000 of worthless continental money. Vigo died before the new nation redeemed the money.

When Missouri's Centennial is celebrated, may it not be forgotten that back as far as 1776 those first white Missourians had no insignificant part in the achievement of American independence. Those liberty-loving Missourians were under a flag at peace with Great Britain but their sympa-

thy with the American cause prompted them to patriotic action.

The British knew this at the time. Their official records furnish the evidence. They planned carefully the "reduction of Pencur," (St. Louis) by surprise. They sent their own redcoats, with Indian allies armed and fed to make the attack. They meant to capture, St. Louis, Ste. Genevieve and all of the settlements, and gain the country west of the Mississippi to Great Britain, with "the rich fur trade of the Missouri river." The aid and sympathy which the habitants were giving the American "rebels" furnished the excuse. Canadian archives still preserved tell the motive and history of this expedition to capture the Missouri country for Great Britain. They tell of the discovery of lead loaded on batteaux to go to the American "rebels." They give in detail the account of the attack upon St. Louis in 1780 and lament the repulse of the British. But they find consolation in such fruits of the expedition as "many hundreds of cattle were destroyed and forty-three scalps were brought in."

The next year the Missourians struck back. Captain Beausoleil, with sixty-five white men and about as many Indians, marched from St. Louis on the 2nd of January over the prairies of Illinois, passed around the head of Lake Michigan, and surprised the British post of St. Joseph. With the contents of the post Beausoleil bought his way through the country of the British Indian allies and got back to St. Louis bringing the British flag.

American history of the Revolutionary period, in its far-reaching results, is not limited to the fighting along the Atlantic seaboard as the books written by the students of that section might lead the reader to suppose.

In the garb of a national issue, Missouri was received into the Union. When Robert M. Stewart was governor, in the term preceding 1861, he described Missouri as "a peninsula of slavery running out into a sea of freedom."

Champ Clark once said: "Missouri has been the stormy petrel of American politics. The richest, the most imperial

commonwealth in the Union, her geographical position placed her in the thick of the fight. The most serious trouble on the slavery question came with her admission into the Union, and the second over the admission of California,—a Missouri colony. Most people date hostilities from Sumter, April, 1861. As a matter of fact, Missouri and Kansas had been carrying on a civil war on their own hook for five or six years before the first gun was fired in Charleston harbor. If Sir Walter Scott had lived in that day," Champ Clark concluded, "he could have found material for fifty novels descriptive of border warfare in the forays and exploits of the Missourians and Kansans before the first soldier was legally mustered into the service of either army."

For forty years Missouri was this "stormy petrel" while the issue of slavery grew into an impending crisis. Within that period the growth of population, of trade, of development in resources, and in culture was marvelous. Before the war Missouri had fifty-two institutions of higher education. Missouri ranked, in population, twenty-third of the States when admitted to the Union. In ten years the State advanced to twenty-first place. In 1840, Missouri was sixteenth. In 1850, the State was thirteenth. In 1870, Missouri reached fifth place.

A battle, according to the Civil war definition, was an engagement in which ten or more soldiers were killed or wounded. Of the 2,261 battles of the Civil war, 244, more than one-tenth, were in Missouri. This State is credited with having sent 109,000 men into the Union armies. This was a number larger than any of the other States except New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana and Massachusetts. Price took 5,000 Missourians with him east of the Mississippi river in April, 1862, and with Missourians already there formed the 1st and 2nd Missouri Confederate brigades, numbering 10,000 men. These Missouri Confederates fought their last battle the day that Lee surrendered. They had been reduced to 400 men. General James Harding estimated the Missourians who fought in Confederate armies west of the Mississippi at 16,800, forming six regiments of

infantry, ten of cavalry and eight batteries. With all of the recruits added from time to time, the Missourians who fought outside of their own State for the Confederacy numbered more than 30,000. Thus it appears that 139,000 Missourians went into either the Union or the Confederate armies. These 139,000 Missouri fighters were fourteen per cent of the entire population of the State, or sixty per cent of all within military age. The mortality was estimated at 25,885. Is there any other state record of the Civil war to compare with this!

Missourians faced Missourians on scores of battlefields. When the commission appointed to mark the lines and to erect a monument at Vicksburg consulted the records they were amazed at the extent of Missouri's participation. On the Union side at Vicksburg, Missouri was represented by twenty-five organizations and on the Confederate side by seventeen. But while Missourians fought valiantly everywhere for what they believed to be right, the war was at its worst within the State. "In Missouri," said Champ Clark, "the war was waged with unspeakable bitterness, sometimes with inhuman cruelty. It was fought by men in single combat, in squads, in companies, in regiments, in great armies, in the open, in fortified town, and in ambush, under the Stars and Stripes, under the Stars and Bars, and under the black flag."

Unpreparedness was the state of the Union when the Civil war came. Men could be enlisted. Guns and uniforms could be bought. Cartridges could be made. The fighting began as if no thereafter was taken into consideration. Back from the front trickled the first streams of wounded and sick. They swelled rapidly. From Wilson's Creek in mid-August of 1861 were brought to St. Louis 721 wounded men. In all of the city there were not hospital accommodations for so many. The Western Sanitary Commission was born of great emergency. And its birthplace and earliest development was in Missouri. There was the emergency. Where was the man? He was found, southern by birth, of Tennessee, Missourian by twenty years of business activity,

James E. Yeatman. "Old Sanitary" he became known in a thousand circling camps. Other Missourians held up his hands, but James E. Yeatman was the master mind of the Western Sanitary Commission which took care of the thousands of wounded, organized relief for the multitudes of refugees. Missouri, the State, St. Louis, the city and Missourians by thousands contributed to the funds which the Commission expended. The organization became the model for the whole country. When the war ended it appeared that this Commission born in Missouri, managed by Missourians, had expended the enormous sum of $4,270,098.55, in money and stores for the relief of the suffering caused by the war.

At the close of the Civil war, in 1865, Missouri had a debt of $36,094,908. Missouri's property losses directly from the war were many millions, not counting the values of the slaves. In 1860, the taxable wealth of the State was $500,000,000. In 1868, after the State had had three years of recuperation, the taxable wealth was $46,000,000 less than it was at the beginning of the war.

The incidents, the details of the conflict within the State, from 1861 to 1865, were almost incredible. They are shocking to this generation. But recalling of those terrible experiences in connection with this coming celebration of one hundred years of statehood will be well justified by the record of what followed the war in Missouri. Almost as quickly as the storm of strife burst in 1861, came the calm of peace and recuperation and the restoration of law and order among Missourians in 1865. Nowhere else along the border, nowhere else in the country, were the wounds healed, the scars removed as rapidly as in Missouri.

Missourians, in the fullest sense, accepted the results of arms. The patriotic sentiments expressed by the returning Confederates in the gathering at old Roanoke in Chariton deserve a place in the history of Missouri.

Standing beside the statues of the two great Missouri Unionists, Benton and Blair, in Statuary Hall, of the Capitol at Washington, Vest, who had been on the opposite side in

the issue of the rights of the States, who had been a Confederate Senator, said:

"These men sleep together in Missouri soil almost side by side, and so long as this Capitol shall stand, or this nation exist, these statues will be eloquent although silent pledges of Missouri's eternal allegiance to an eternal Union."

Missouri has an acre of water to every hundred acres of soil. This is surface, running water. Missouri has few lakes, almost no stagnant water. Account is not taken of the amazing underground water courses and veins everywhere which insure the potable supply.

Missouri has water for transportation. The entire eastern frontage and half of the western frontage is on navigable water. The State is bisected by navigable water. When the time comes for the return to these natural routes of transportation in the fullness of their possibilities, Missourians will realize more than they did in the first century what these advantages mean.

Missouri has water for power. No other State, perhaps no other country, presents conditions so encouraging to the coming energy,—hydro-electric. "Water power," said Haswell, the modern historian of the Ozarks, "more of it, twice over, than has made the six stony New England States the richest of the nation. Not only so, but with a far greater variety of uses for it than New England has, or ever had. Water powers so situated, some of them, as to be susceptible of developing without so much as a dam." Mr. Haswell has in mind the numerous bends and curves which, cut through, will give a mill race with almost incalculable force for the turbines.

Missouri has water for medicine. The spas awaiting the certain development in time, and of endless variety in constituents,—a hundred kinds of mineral waters in one small circumscribed area.

And then think of the aesthetic meaning! Charlevoix, traversing continents before the settlement, saw the union of the Missouri and the Mississippi, and said of it:

"I believe this is the finest confluence in the world. The two rivers are much of the same breadth, each about half a league, but the Missouri is by far the most rapid, and seems to enter the Mississippi like a conqueror, through which it carries its white waves to the opposite shore without mixing them. Afterwards it gives its color to the Mississippi, which it never loses again, but carries quite down to the sea."

Before Missouri's first century was two-thirds completed, an eminent lawyer, who yielded occasionally to the muse, dedicated these lines to—

TWO ANCIENT MISSES

I know two ancient misses
Who ever onward go,
From a cold and frigid northern clime,
Through a land of wheat and corn and wine,
To the southern sea where the fig and the lime,
And the golden orange grow.

In graceful curves they wind about
Upon their long and lonely route
Among the beauteous hills;
They never cease their onward step,
Though day and night they're dripping wet,
And oft with sleet and snow beset,
And sometimes with the chills.

The one is a romping, dark brunette,
As fickle and gay as any coquette;
She glides along by the western plains,
And changes her bed each time it rains;
Witching as any dark-eyed houri,
This romping, wild brunette, Missouri.

The other is placid, mild and fair,
With a gentle, sylph-like, quiet air,
And voice as sweet as soft guitar,
She moves along the vales and parks,
Where Naiads play Aeolian harps—
Nor ever goes by fits and starts—
No fickle coquette of the city,
But gentle, consistent Mississippi.

I love the wild and dark brunette,
Because she is a gay coquette;
Her, too, I love, of quiet air,
Because she's gentle, true and fair;
Land of my birth! The east and west
Embraced by these is doubly blest—
'Tis hard to tell which I love best.

A theme to their liking the pageant masters of the Missouri Centennial will find in the pioneer days; when the Armstrong mill, turned with the strong arm, kept the meal bag supplied; when the Missourians, as they founded their new homes sang:

"Our cabins are made of logs of wood,
The floors are made of puncheon,
The roof is held by weighted poles
And then we 'hang off' for luncheon."

Commerce meant the construction of "longhorns," as the flatboats of cottonwood logs were called, to float the cured hog meat and other products down the Missouri and the Mississippi to the St. Louis market.

The hunting tales are innumerable. Five bears killed within what are the limits of the City of Boonville! One man killed twenty-two bears in three days in the Missouri bottoms. To go out and get three deer before breakfast was not extraordinary with those Missouri nimrods. In Montgomery county the deer were so plentiful one winter that according to the traditions one man killed forty-five in a single day. Daniel Boone is credited with having said Missouri was such good country for game that he felt it was time to move when he couldn't kill a deer from his front door.

They sang in their joy of living, those early Missourians, such ballads as Barbara Allen and My Pretty Little Ben. Another favorite was:

"John, John, the piper's son,
He married me when I was young;
We journeyed toward the setting sun,
Over the hills and far away."

Then came the excitement over the discovery of gold in California. Missouri was the highway of the argonauts. Judge D. C. Allen has told how when he was a boy they marched through Liberty, then the largest, farthest west community of Missouri. And as they passed through Liberty, disappearing over the hills, the unending refrain was:

"Oh California! That is the land for me,
I'm bound for Sacramento with my washbowl onto me."

The washbowl was the inevitable part of the equipment, for placer mining was the only way of getting out the "yellow boys" of that time.

The first steamboat was thirteen days plowing the Missouri from St. Louis to Old Franklin in Howard county. But before the treacherous banks destroyed Old Franklin's hopes of metropolitan greatness as many as forty boats passed there in a single day. There were the Hudson and the Brandywine of which Judge Allen says, the song ran:

"The Hudson is a bully boat,
She runs very fine,
But she can't raise steam enough
To beat the Brandywine.
The captain's on the pilot deck,
Snorting very loud,
And the ladies think
It's thunder in the cloud."

In what other part of the Union can be found the counterpart of Missouri's Ozarks? Some twenty years ago, a thoughtful man stood before the great map of the United States and said:

"As it appears to me, there are just three places left in this country where a man with a little can go and have almost the absolute certainty of making a great deal. I mean we have three sections which seem to have been passed by while the rest of the country was being occupied, and to which at some time in the not distant future there is going to be an influx of population and capital. One of these sections is that southwestern corner of Texas between the Rio Grande

and the Gulf of Mexico. I don't know much about it; was never there, but if the question of moisture can be answered that strip is going to be a great place for early vegetable and fruit culture. Another place is the Indian Territory. Of course it will be necessary to await the action of the government in opening the reservations, which cannot be delayed much longer. The third and largest of these sections and the one which I would choose if I was going somewhere 'to grow up with the country' is right there."

The thoughtful man pointed to the Ozark country of Missouri. He had never been there but he noted that the railroad builders of the South and West had rushed by and had left a great block of the oldest part of the American continent undeveloped. The twenty years that have passed since this study of the map have witnessed the transformation of the Indian reservations into a State. Southwest Texas has come into its own. And now, as the centennial year approaches, the long overlooked Ozarks promise to focus attention of the fruit raisers, the dairymen, the chicken farmers and the seekers of ideal refuge from the summer heat of the cities.

A strange combination of old and new the Ozark country presents. One meets a man who has just come from the North and is enthusiastic over the healthful home he has acquired at small cost. The next acquaintance may be a native whose family, back to his grandfather, has lived right there. The Ozark country was settled before the Missouri Valley was. The oldest town in Missouri is out in the Ozark country. Pioneers found their way into the Ozarks long before Missouri was a State. They discovered the valleys, and the salubrity of the climate, and they made homes on the slopes and plateaus while Iowa was still Indian country. Descendants of these pioneers live there today, and now, a century after those early settlers came, the Ozark country is so sparsely occupied that there are stretches of virgin forest where the deer graze and the turkeys roost. Legends and landmarks abound in the Ozarks. One of the richest fields of folklore is found there. Just a mere beginning of the possible literature of the Ozarks has been made.

"Missouri," said Champ Clark, "is proud of her immeasurable physical resources, which will one day make her facile princeps among her sisters; but there is something else of which she is prouder still, and that is her splendid citizenship, consisting at this day of nearly 4,000,000 industrious, intelligent, patriotic, progressive, law-abiding, God-fearing people."

In 1910 Missouri had, in round numbers, 3,300,000 people of whom only 230,000 were of foreign birth. Missouri is producing the typical American. With all of the exodus of the generations to build up the West, the native stock is still notably strong. According to the latest government census Missourians by birth are 72 per cent of the population. From other parts of the Union have gravitated to Missouri 840,131 natives of other States finding Missouri more attractive for homes than their own commonwealths. And yet three of every quartet of Missourians were born in Missouri. Illinois has sent 186,611 of her sons and daughters to become Missourians. Kentucky, Kansas, Ohio, Tennessee, Indiana and Iowa, each has contributed over 50,000 of their natives to become adopted Missourians. From the four points of the American compass, from every State in the Union have come these elements to help make the typical American.

Champ Clark once commented humorously upon the political disturbance which followed backward waves of migration from the West into Missouri. That was in the past days of grasshoppers and drought. A Missouri ballad ran in hospitable strain:

> "Come join in the chorus and sing its fame,
> You poor lonely settler that's stuck on a claim.
> 'Farewell to this country; farewell to the West!
> I'll travel back east to the girl I love best.
> I'll stop in Missouri and get me a wife,
> And live on corn dodger the rest of my life.' "

Lizzie Chambers Hull, in her Song of Missouri, which won the award of the most fitting a few years ago, embodied this idea of Missouri hospitality and welcome:

"She came a compromise for peace;
Her prayer is still that strife may cease;
She mourned her blue, wept o'er her gray,
When side by side, in death they lay—
Missouri.
"Nor North, nor South, nor East, nor West,
But part of each—of each the best,
Come homeless one, come to her call;
Her arms are stretched to shelter all—
Missouri."

"Parsimony in education is liberality in crime," said one governor of Missouri, Crittenden, in his inaugural address.

What State can show four educators who did more than William T. Harris and James M. Greenwood for grade and high schools; than Calvin M. Woodward, the pioneer in manual training which won him and his State international renown; than Miss Susie T. Blow, content to be the mother of the kindergarten in the United States?

Missouri led in co-education with Christian University as early as 1851. Normal teaching by the State will observe its semi-centennial only a year after the centennial of statehood.

It is tradition that when James S. Rollins had secured the foundation and when John Hiram Lathrop was about to begin the organization of the University of Missouri, a man who could not read or write at that time subscribed $3,000 toward the fund to put the institution in practical operation. True or not, the tradition is believable of a Missourian, for the passion to acquire education has been among Missourians through all time, even from before those winter months when Riddick rode his horse from St. Louis to Washington to get Congress to set aside public lands in Missouri for public school purposes. A poor boy who began business life in a country store reached the Missouri Legislature and framed a bill for the establishment of a college which should neither teach politics nor impose distinction of religious creed. That institution has achieved an endowment and property representing $15,000,000, not a dollar of which has come from the United States, the State of Missouri or the City of St. Louis.

Washington University has been built with the offerings of men, the great majority of whom never had the advantages of higher education. Just a century ago promoters founded what they hoped was destined to be a great city near the center of the State and in their attractive literature held out the inducement that an academy would be established at once under the management of a distinguished educator. They knew the Missourians.

In the early summer of 1917, the beginning of Missouri's centennial period, the planners of cities will come from all parts of this country and Canada to observe how a Missouri community has transformed its site, logical as to trade but eccentric as to topography, into a vast gridiron of green and beauty, all to the moral elevation of the people and to material gain measured by the rank of the third city in percentage of increase of population shown by the last government census. In "the making of a city" there is not another object lesson such as is furnished where the Committee of One Thousand now deliberates on plans for the celebration of the centennial statehood.

It was distinctly fitting that Journalism should first become a professional study, a part of the university curriculum, in a State which has been distinguished for its successful newspapers. One newspaper celebrated its centennial of continuous and honorable existence twelve years before the State completed its hundred years. Three men became Missourians by adoption in their young manhood and created from modest if not precarious beginnings three of the most profitable and influential newspaper properties in the United States. They gave to them such distinctive qualities and such character that when these guiding hands were cold the newspapers went on their prosperous and masterful ways without check or loss of prestige in any degree. McCullagh, Pulitzer, Nelson! What a journalistic pace they set in the first century of Missouri!

The slave population of Missouri was not large in comparison with the white people. Slavery, bad enough at best, was mitigated by the patriarchal treatment bestowed by the owners, as a rule. In the first list of taxpayers of Missouri were several negroes who owned real estate. When Robert Lewis went to California with the argonauts of 1849, he took with him Jesse Hubbard, his wife's slave. Lewis panned "pay dirt" and came back with $15,000. The money was divided impartially between master and slave. Hubbard took his share and bought a Missouri farm.

According to the statistician of the State, Missouri had, in 1913, nearly 3,800 farms owned by negroes, estimated to be worth $27,768,000. Nearly every negro farmer in Missouri, the statistician said, had a bank account.

In 1913, the sweepstakes premium for "the highest yield of corn on one acre," awarded by the University of Missouri, went to a negro farmer, N. C. Bruce, the head of the Bartlett Agricultural and Industrial School for negroes at Dalton in Chariton county, one of the centers of Missouri slave population before the war. In 1915 Bruce won the premium for the United States on corn shown at the San Francisco Exposition. His record in 1913 was, officially, 108 bushels on a single acre. The negro students of the Dalton school raised an average of more than sixty-five bushels on the entire field of sixty acres.

"Some of us," wrote Bruce in a personal letter recently, "the State's farthest down humanity, want to be saved to better service. We want our people to become desirable assets instead of a liability on white citizens. We know that the farms, farming and domestic service training, offer us our best opportunity. We have shown our white neighbors and are trying to show white lawmakers and authorities of the State that we, country life Missouri black people, are worth saving equally as our brothers in Alabama and other southern States. We follow the lines of the late Booker T. Washington and get even quicker and better results with the poorest equipment."

A Missourian of the old French stock, hurrying along the St. Louis Levee in ante-bellum days to catch a steamboat, tossed his carpetbag to a slave boy to carry. Fewer than twenty years later these two Missourians met in the United States Senate chamber at Washington. Both were United States Senators, Bogy from Missouri, Bruce from Mississippi to which State he had gone after his education at Harvard.

Vest, on the floor of the United States Senate, paid this tribute to the negro, as he had known him, slave and free:

"If any man in this world has reason to be their friend, I am that man, raised with them, nursed by one, a humble owner of them as inherited property. They are a docile, gentle, inoffensive race, and the southern man who would wrong them deserves to be blotted from the roll of manhood. When our wives and children were in their hands during the war they acted so as to make every man of the South their friend who had a particle of manhood about him."

In the first constitution of Missouri were a half score of sections devoted to slavery. One provided for jury trial of a slave charged with serious crime. Another forbade any more severe penalty for a convicted negro than for a convicted white man. A third section required the legislature to pass laws which would "oblige the owners of slaves to treat them with humanity and to abstain from all injuries to them extending to life and limb."

The slaves of Missouri numbered nearly 100,000 when the war began. Freedom came suddenly and without preparation through the action of a constitutional convention in 1865. It was viewed with apprehension by many white Missourians. Events showed that the Missouri negro was, as Vest subsequently pictured him. Men of southern birth and training, like James E. Yeatman, took hold of the situation. By private subscription, funds were raised and schools were started for negro children in Missouri. A negro regiment composed in the main of former slaves of Missouri started

the fund with which the location for Lincoln Institute at Jefferson City to educate negro teachers was purchased. When $15,000 had been raised the State redeemed a promise, took over the institution and conducted it with public funds. Emancipation conditions adjusted themselves in Missouri without the years of mistakes and antagonisms which occurred in the South. One of the first negro schools established in the State, perhaps the first outside of St. Louis, was in the outskirts of Kansas City. A supporter of it was Jesse James. "But for Jesse James," said the teacher of this school, not long before he died, "I could not have kept up the school."

Long before a railroad from the East reached the Illinois bank Missouri began stretching the iron parallels toward the West. Before the war Missouri had loaned her splendid credit toward railroad construction to the amount of $20,701,000. In four years the citizens and city of St. Louis had subscribed $6,400,000 to start four railroads in the four directions of the compass. That was at the rate of about $50, for every man, woman and child of the population. Railroad policies in Missouri had elements of popularity in those days. One of the first trains across the State was rocking its way at night over the primitive roadbed when a lusty Missouri infant set up a howling solo which continued in spite of the efforts of its mother. The president of the road was one of the passengers, he got up from his seat went forward and took the baby. He paced up and down the aisle of the coach until quiet was restored. As the baby was given back to her, the mother apologized for the trouble caused.

"Madam," replied President Robert Morris Stewart, "it is the duty of the officers of a railroad to do all they can for the comfort of the people who travel with them."

The pioneer railroad builder of Missouri was Thomas Allen, whose father started him in life with a twenty-dollar bill. When Mr. Allen had seen the Missouri Pacific well

on the way across the State, he thought of retiring from business and devoting himself to his favorite recreation,—raising grapes. But he came back.

"I can't stand it," he said, "I must have occupation for all my energies. He took hold of the Iron Mountain railroad, then only eighty miles long, and built it through the Ozarks and Arkansas to its Texas connections. The ebbing of life found Thomas Allen still in the public service of the people with whom he had chosen his home. Almost the last words of this constructive Missourian were:

"I would like to live a few years longer. There are some things I would like to do for Missouri."

At the age of thirteen James B. Eads sold apples in the commercial district of Missouri. He did it so well that an observing merchant gave him a small clerkship and, what was more, the privilege of his library. Young Eads invented machinery revolutionized the raising of sunken steamboats. He built seven ironclads in sixty-five days, with which the Union armies opened the Mississippi. He built a bridge of such original design and construction that on its completion it became one of the engineering wonders of the world. He confounded the wise men at Washington with the jetties which opened the mouth of the Mississippi. When he went abroad the greatest scientific societies of Europe showered unusual honors upon him.

Some years ago, Dean Walter Williams wrote a newspaper plea for an adequate history of Missouri. He made it plain that no history of the State that was complete had been written. He was right. There are histories of Missouri, and good histories, but they are histories of Missouri only in part. The masterly and exhaustive three volumes of Louis Houck come down through the Colonial and the Territorial Missouri, and stop at 1820. Trexler's "Slavery in Missouri;" Carr's "Missouri, a Bone of Contention;" Shoemaker's "Struggle for Statehood;" and several other books on Missouri are invaluable. All of these efforts go to show what a wonderful field Missouri offers to the historical student and

writer. And they suggest this conclusion: No one man ever will write a complete history of Missouri. Good Old Colonel William F. Switzler delved and wrote fascinating Missouri history until he went almost blind. When the light failed he was just in the midst of the work he loved. Champ Clark began to write history of Missouri and had put down on paper 150,000 words, only to realize the vastness of the field. No one man will write a complete history of Missouri for there is in the State's first century the waiting material for scores of volumes on Missouri and for hundreds of volumes on Missourians.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 572 835 6